



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/092,987	03/07/2002	Jeremy Alan Arnold	ROC920010332US1	8551

7590 03/11/2005

Gero G. McClellan
Moser, Patterson & Sheridan, L.L.P.
Suite 1500
3040 Post Oak Boulevard
Houston, TX 77056-6582

EXAMINER

TRUONG, CAM Y T

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2162

DATE MAILED: 03/11/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/092,987

Applicant(s)

ARNOLD ET AL.

Examiner

Cam Y T Truong

Art Unit

2162

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 01 November 2004.
- 2a) ☒ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-23 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-23 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-23 are pending in this Office Action.

Applicant's arguments filed 11/1/2004 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argued that Bodamer does not explicitly teach "generating a recommendation based on the code portion for restructuring the corresponding SQL statement". However, Bodamer teaches the appropriate module 210 generating the request performs a substitution to converts the SQL statement from select *from allusers@FDS to select from (select join A, B)@FDS, which is then passed to the FDS database. The above information indicates that the system restructures the selected SQL statement by converting existing SQL statement to a new SQL statement (col. 17, lines 45-55).

For the above reason, examiner believed that rejection of the last office action was proper.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Art Unit: 2162

3. Claims 1, 2, 5-13, 16-18, 20, 22, 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Helgeson et al (or hereinafter "Helgeson") (US 6643652) in view of Bodamer et al (or hereinafter "Bodamer") (US 6236997).

As to claim 1, Helgeson teaches the claimed limitations:

"receiving a code portion" as upon receiving a request to create an in-memory representation of an object through the restore() method, the BDK retrieves the SQL selection statement for that class object (col. 24, lines 45-50);

"attempting to retrieve a corresponding structured query language (SQL) statement that corresponds with the code portion" as upon receiving a request to create an in-memory representation of an object through the restore() method, the BDK retrieves the SQL selection statement for that class object (col. 24, lines 45-50);

Helgeson does not explicitly teach the claimed limitation "generating a recommendation based on the code portion for restructuring the corresponding SQL statement". However, Bodamer teaches the appropriate module 210 generating the request performs a substitution to converts the SQL statement from select *from allusers@FDS to select from (select join A, B)@FDS, which is then passed to the FDS database. The above information indicates that the system restructures the selected SQL statement by converting existing SQL statement to a new SQL statement (col. 17, lines 45-55).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time invention was made to apply Bodamer's teaching of the appropriate module 210 generating the request performs a substitution to converts the SQL statement from

Art Unit: 2162

select *from allusers@FDS to select from (select join A, B)@FDS, which is then passed to the FDS database to Helgeson's system in order to allow a user to designate the selected query following user's desires, to allow a user to create, manipulate, and query a database and to allow a user to alter the queries submitted to dynamically modify or enter SQL statements and quickly see results.

As to claims 2, 13 and 20, Helgeson and Bodamer disclose the claimed limitation subject matter in claims 1, 12 and 18, Bodamer further teaches the claimed limitation "wherein the recommendation comprises one of a recommended SQL statement and a textual spoken language recommendation" as (col. 17, lines 45-55)

As to claims 5, 16 and 22, Helgeson and Bodamer disclose the claimed limitation subject matter in claim 1, Bodamer further teaches the claimed limitation "prior to retrieving the corresponding SQL statement, determining whether the code portion can be modified to be processed more efficiently by substituting the corresponding SQL statement with the recommended SQL statement". Bodamer teaches the appropriate module 210 generating the request performs a substitution to convert the SQL statement from select * from allusers@FDS to select * from (select *Join A, B)@FDS, which is then passed to the FDS database. The above information indicates the system determines the appropriate module 210 can be modified to be processed more efficiently by substituting the SQL statement from select * from allusers@FDS to select *

Art Unit: 2162

from (select *Join A, B)@FDS, which is then passed to the FDS database.

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time invention was made to apply Bodamer's teaching of the appropriate module 210 generating the request performs a substitution to converts the SQL statement from select *from allusers@FDS to select from (select join A, B)@FDS, which is then passed to the FDS database to Helgeson's system in order to allow a user to designate the selected query following user's desires, to allow a user to create, manipulate, and query a database and to allow a user to alter the queries submitted to dynamically modify or enter SQL statements and quickly see results.

As to claim 6, Helgeson and Bodamer disclose the claimed limitation subject matter in claim 1, Bodamer further teaches the claimed limitation "wherein the recommended SQL statement performs at least one function performed by the code portion" as (col. 18, lines 20-65).

As to claims 5, 16 and 22, Helgeson and Bodamer disclose the claimed limitation subject matter in claim 1, Bodamer further teaches the claimed limitation "prior to generating the recommended SQL statement, retrieving a database type for providing a proper syntax for the recommended SQL statement" as (col. 18, lines 20-60; col. 17, lines 45-55).

Art Unit: 2162

As to claims 8, 17, and 23, Helgeson teaches the claimed limitation “wherein the code portion is configured to retrieve independent fields from a database” as (col. 14, lines 15-25).

As to claim 9, Helgeson teaches the claimed limitation “wherein the code portion is in Java” as (col. 28, lines 20-25).

As to claim 10, Helgeson teaches the claimed limitation “wherein retrieving the corresponding SQL statement comprises retrieving the corresponding SQL statement from a prior execution of the code portion” as (col. 24, lines 45-50).

As to claim 11, Helgeson teaches the claimed limitation “retrieving the corresponding SQL statement from a repository of predefined SQL statements” as (col. 24, lines 45-50).

As to claim 12, Helgeson teaches the claimed limitations:

“receiving a code portion” as upon receiving a request to create an in-memory representation of an object through the restore() method, the BDK retrieves the SQL selection statement for that class object (col. 24, lines 45-50);

“attempting to retrieve a corresponding structured query language (SQL) statement that corresponds with the code portion” as upon receiving a request to create

an in-memory representation of an object through the restore() method, the BDK retrieves the SQL selection statement for that class object (col. 24, lines 45-50);

Helgeson does not explicitly teach the claimed limitation "and generating a recommendation based on the code portion for restructuring the corresponding SQL statement" "generating a recommendation based on the code portion for restructuring the corresponding SQL statement". Bodamer teaches the appropriate module 210 generating the request performs a substitution to converts the SQL statement from select *from allusers@FDS to select from (select join A, B)@FDS, which is then passed to the FDS database. The above information indicates that the system restructures the selected SQL statement by converting existing SQL statement to a new SQL statement (col. 17, lines 45-55).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time invention was made to apply Bodamer's teaching of the appropriate module 210 generating the request performs a substitution to converts the SQL statement from select *from allusers@FDS to select from (select join A, B)@FDS, which is then passed to the FDS database to Helgeson's system in order to allow a user to designate the selected query following user's desires, to allow a user to create, manipulate, and query a database and to allow a user to alter the queries submitted to dynamically modify or enter SQL statements and quickly see results.

As to claim 18, Helgeson teaches the claimed limitations:

Art Unit: 2162

“a memory containing a programming assistance program for an integrated development environment”; as (col. 4, lines 40-50; col. 5, lines 55-65);

“and a processor which, when executing the programming assistance program, performs an operation comprising: receiving a code portion” as upon receiving a request to create an in-memory representation of an object through the restore() method, the BDK retrieves the SQL selection statement for that class object (col. 24, lines 45-50);

“attempting to retrieve a corresponding structured query language (SQL) statement that corresponds with the code portion” as upon receiving a request to create an in-memory representation of an object through the restore() method, the BDK retrieves the SQL selection statement for that class object (col. 24, lines 45-50).

Bodamer does not explicitly teach the claimed limitation “and generating a recommendation based on the code portion for restructuring the corresponding SQL statement”. However, Bodamer teaches the appropriate module 210 generating the request performs a substitution to converts the SQL statement from select *from allusers@FDS to select from (select join A, B)@FDS, which is then passed to the FDS database. The above information indicates that the system restructures the selected SQL statement by converting existing SQL statement to a new SQL statement (col. 17, lines 45-55).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time invention was made to apply Bodamer’s teaching of the appropriate module 210 generating the request performs a substitution to converts the SQL statement from select *from allusers@FDS to select from (select join A, B)@FDS, which is then passed

Art Unit: 2162

to the FDS database to Helgeson's system in order to allow a user to designate the selected query following user's desires, to allow a user to create, manipulate, and query a database and to allow a user to alter the queries submitted to dynamically modify or enter SQL statements and quickly see results.

4. Claims 3, 4, 14, 15 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Helgeson et al (or hereinafter "Helgeson") (US 6643652) in view of Bodamer and further in view of Brown et al (or hereinafter "Brown") (US 2003/0093408).

As to claims 3 and 14, Helgeson and Bodamer disclose the claimed limitation subject matter in claims 1 and 12, except the claimed limitation "displaying the recommendation". Brown teaches displaying SQL statements to allow a user select them (page 13, col. Left, lines 10-20; col. Right, lines 18-25).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Brown's teaching of displaying SQL statements to allow a user select them to Helgeson and Bodamer's system in order to allow a user can see the structure of a SQL statement to deciding further selection.

As to claims 4, 15 and 21, Helgeson and Bodamer disclose the claimed limitation subject matter in claims 1 and 12, except the claimed limitation "displaying the corresponding SQL statement and the recommended SQL statement". Brown teaches displaying SQL statements to allow a user select them (page 13, col. Left, lines 10-20; col. Right, lines 18-25).

Art Unit: 2162

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Brown's teaching of displaying SQL statements to allow a user select them to Helgeson and Bodamer's system in order to allow a user can see the structure of a SQL statement to deciding further selection.

As to claim 19, Helgeson and Bodamer disclose the claimed limitation subject matter in claim 1, except the claimed limitation "a display device and wherein the operation further comprises displaying the recommendation on the display device". Brown teaches displaying SQL statements to allow a user select them (page 13, col. Left, lines 10-20; col. Right, lines 18-25).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Brown's teaching of displaying SQL statements to allow a user select them to Helgeson and Bodamer's system in order to allow a user can see the structure of a SQL statement to deciding further selection.

Conclusion

5. THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any

Art Unit: 2162

extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.


Contact Information

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Cam Y T Truong whose telephone number is (571) 272-4042. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Breene can be reached on (571) 272-4107. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Cam-Y Truong
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 2162
3/2/2005


SHAHID ALAM
PRIMARY EXAMINER